Postal Regulatory Commission Submitted 1/13/2012 4:21:54 PM Filing ID: Prince Statement Accepted 1/13/2012

BEFORE THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20268

In the Matter of:			
St Anthony Post Office	, <u>IA</u> State	50239 ZIP Code	Docket No: A 2012-96
John Be	nedict	_, Petitioner(s)	
PARTICIPANT STATEMENT			
			dervice's Final Determination concerning ination was posted 1/3// (date)
2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)(5), the Petitioner(s) request the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the Postal Service's determination on the basis of the record before the Postal Service in the making of the determination.			
3. Petitioners: Please set out below the reasons why you believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration. (See pages of the Instructions for an outline of the kinds of reasons the law requires us to consider.) Please be as specific as possible. Please continue on additional paper if you need more space and attach the additional page(s) to this form.			
See AH	ached:		
Author reaches all control control delications are assumed as a control suppose for	er i e e e en		
/	The state of the s		
		Page 5	Wednesday, August 10, 2011 Pag

PRC Form 61

Participant Statement:

- A. With regard to the effect on the community. Many of the people here are reliant on the Post Office here for the high level of personal customer service. Often times needing longer times to prepare mailings. They do not or can not drive and still need to mail packages, many times needing supplies to accomplish this, and purchase money orders to pay bills. Having to drive or find someone to take them to State Center (a 20+ mile trip) is quite difficult for many of our residents from parents with small children needing car seats to elderly with special needs. St. Anthony has grown at least 10% in the last year and we expect that trend to continue. There have been two new businesses and one very large expansion to a business here and we definitely see the loss of the Post Office as a negative effect on the ability to attract more business. In the proposal it stated that the OIC had said that no growth was expected, that is incorrect. Another negative effect will be on our current business, Dunn Grain LLC. They rely on the ability to respond to the mail they receive the same day, especially as it seems mail seems to take longer to travel from place to place more and more. Requiring a quick turn around.
- B. In the Proposal it states that the employee may be re-assigned and that was also said at the community meeting when the question was asked what would happen to the Postmaster here, it was said that she would be transferred to another office if agreed on. Then we read in the Final Determination that it said the OIC may be separated, that is a big difference. We have two problems with that, one the change in what was proposed and said at the meeting and two, if she is transferred to another office then the savings amount in the proposal would not have been correctly calculated and would have been grossly over estimated.
- C. Maximum degree of effective and regular Postal Service to rural areas, communities and small towns where post offices are not self sustaining. Not providing effective service is taking the Post Office out of rural America. We will not have the same universal service that the urban areas enjoy even though that is one of the purposes for the mandate above. Unlike urban Americans we do not have mass transit or cabs. The State Center Post Office is listed as 10 miles however that would be a 20 mile trip and for most

Docket No: A2012-96

people it would actually be farther than that. We have no other option for a qualifying alternative retail facility such as a VPO here. So we would have to travel 20+ miles to have packages weighed and the postage figured out and to purchase money orders because in reality it is unrealistic and very risky for us and the carrier to ask us to put cash in our mail boxes with a note for the carrier for the amounts of the money orders we want and then he bring back the blank money orders and leave them in our mail boxes the next day. That is just wrong on so many levels, it's not timely, it's not safe for us or the carrier, it's just plain not effective, nor service in any sense of the word. Not to mention any of the things that could go wrong with this scenario. Many of the people here also get medicine by mail. That is a great concern for people worried about what effect the weather will have on the medicine. We also have many people who choose to have PO Boxes because they receive a lot of other items in the mail that are temperature sensitive. Once again that is not effective service. There is so much more to delivering the mail than just delivering letters.

Docket No: A2012-96

D. As to the economic savings, while it is true that there would be some savings however it was overstated in both the proposal and the final determination due to many factors. Our post office has scored in the high range of revenue for many many years. But factors that were incorrect were the issue of the employee. One being that the OIC here gets no benefits, no paid holidays, no sick leave. So the benefit amount was incorrect. Another thing that was not factored in was the cost to dismantle the Post Office. The cost of these proceedings. Also the loss of the paid PO Boxes here that people will not be paying to State Center or anywhere else. The loss of our confidence and trust in the Postal Service. Many people in this community are angry and have stated that if the Post Office here is taken away they will pay there bills online that they mail now to support the community Post Office. So really, considering the economic and social damage the "economic savings" really isn't as much as stated in the paperwork.